SECTION II: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Section I be made to the present application.

In a previous Office Communication mailed 9/20/2006, the Examiner indicated the allowability of designated claims if rewritten in independent form. Applicant in a responding Amendment mailed 10/20/2006 amended the designated claims to put them in condition for allowance. However, in an Office Action mailed 11/22/2006, the Examiner withdrew the previous allowance and rejected all of the claims in view of a newly discovered Perlman reference.

More specifically, in the Office Action mailed 11/22/2006:

Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 13-15, 17-18, 23 and 25-28 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Tettington (U.S. Patent 6,295,065, herein referred to as Tettington"), in view of Perlman (U.S. 6,353,422, herein referred to as "Perlman");

Claims 2, 7-10, 16 and 19-22 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Tettington in view of Perlman and in still further view of Vossler (U.S: Patent 6,115,177, herein referred to as "Vossler"); and

Claims 12 and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Tettington in view of Perlman and in still further view of Lazzaro (U.S. Patent 6,456,432,

herein referred to as "Lazzaro").

The above noted rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended the claims for clarification thereby placing all of the claims in condition for allowance.

It is noted that the present application includes claims 1-28 with claims 1, 14-15 and 26-28 being independent claims, and the remaining claims being ultimately dependent from one of the independent claims. All of the independent claims 1, 14-15 and 26-28 have herein been amended to clarify that in accordance with the present invention, an obscuration of designated information at a predetermined frequency is effected such that said designated information **appears obscured** on the display screen**, said obscuration comprising a superimposition of obscuring indicia over said designated information**. This feature is as disclosed in Figure 5 and the related discussion in the specification.

Tettington does not disclose or suggest the recited feature but instead, actually teaches away from the present invention by, rather than obscuring information present on a display as is done by applicant (e.g. Figure 5, 501, 503,

505, 507), Tettington **cancels or omits alternate lines** on a display for alternate scans. Applicant teaches superimposing obscuration indicia over sensitive areas so that a viewer can see the existence of the field but not the sensitive information contained in the field. Thus, applicant accomplishes a visible obscuration of sensitive fields in a display while Tettington does not visibly obscure fields at all but instead totally omits alternate lines in order to provide a three dimensional effect. The newly cited Perlman reference was cited only to show an alleged authentication process. While applicant does not agree that Perlman shows an authentication process as claimed by applicant, applicant believes that any alleged authentication process of Perlman, is not only not relevant, but also moot, non-compatible and non-applicable, since neither Tettington nor Perlman show or suggest **a superimposition of obscuring indicia over designated sensitive information** as is disclosed and claimed by applicant in claims as currently amended.

Applicant obscures designated information from a display in order to preserve security of the obscured information. Tettington' s objective is to produce a three dimensional image and Perlman' s objective is to scan a virtual image on a retina. Thus, the applicant provides a different process (obscuring) using different means to accomplish a different result than any of the references or even a combination of all of the references. It is further noted that applicant is not claiming that any of the individual elements of the claims as herein presented is new *per se*. Applicant is, however, claiming that the entire **combination**

of elements and relationships among those elements as set out in the claims as herein amended, is patentable. It is established that all inventions are, **and must be**, made up of known elements. However, the referencing of isolated elements in different contexts without any specific or stated suggestion of a beneficial combination or nexus cannot provide the basis to reject applicant's combination claims. Applicant is aware the individual elements of any claim can be isolated, and those elements, in different contexts, can be found in existing references. The similarity of various pieces and parts of the references as noted on pages 2-15 of the above-identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that there is no suggestion or nexus in any of the references to even suggest any combination of those references or the total **combination of elements and relationships as recited in the claims as herein amended.** Where there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references for the specific total combination of elements and relationships among those elements, as claimed by an applicant, it is submitted to be inappropriate to search the prior art using applicant's own disclosure as a recipe, to find piecemeal elements in prior art references for individual claimed elements, and then to combine those references in a manner not disclosed or even suggested by any of the references in order to reject applicant's own claims.

In that connection, it is even further noted that, not only is there no suggestion in the references for the hypothetical combination of references, but any combination of references would render the individual references inoperable for its stated intended purpose thus confirming the absence of any possible suggestion for the proposed combination. For example, to combine the retinal imaging of

Perlman into the three dimensional system of Tettington cannot be suggested because to do so would destroy the three dimensional capability and operability of Tettington. Similarly, to combine Tettington's deletion of alternate scans with Perlman would destroy the retinal imaging capability of Perlman. Since either substitution would destroy the other for its intended purpose, it is unsupportable and illogical to allege that a combination of the two references is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, or that the combination is suggested by either of the references.

Thus, for the reasons stated above, it is believed that all of the amended independent claims 1, 14-15 and 26-28, are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Tettington even in view of Perlman. Moreover, since claims 2-13 and 16-25 ultimately depend from and include all of the limitations of one of the amended independent claims, and include even further limitations as specified in each of the dependent claims, it is also submitted that claims 2-13 and 16-25 are also allowable under 35 USC 103(e) over the applied references.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-28, as herein amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance, an early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting the allowance of this application, and especially if one or more new references are cited, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below, prior to the issuance of another Office Action, in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to further amend the claims

by Supplemental Amendment or Examiner's Amendment, as may be appropriate, to place the claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert V. Wilder/

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681